

EX PARTE OR LATE FILED
LATHAM & WATKINS

DOCKETED BY ORIGINAL

PAUL R. WATKINS (1899-1973)
DANA LATHAM (1898-1974)

ATTORNEYS AT LAW
1001 PENNSYLVANIA AVE., N.W., SUITE 1300
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20004-2505
TELEPHONE (202) 637-2200
FAX (202) 637-2200
TLX 590775
ELN 62793269

CHICAGO OFFICE
SEARS TOWER, SUITE 5800
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60606
TELEPHONE (312) 876-7700
FAX (312) 993-9767

LONDON OFFICE
ONE ANGEL COURT
LONDON EC2R 7HJ ENGLAND
TELEPHONE + 44-71-374 4444
FAX + 44-71-374 4460

LOS ANGELES OFFICE
633 WEST FIFTH STREET, SUITE 4000
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90071-2007
TELEPHONE (213) 485-1234
FAX (213) 891-8763

MOSCOW OFFICE
113/1 LENINSKY PROSPECT, SUITE C200
MOSCOW 117198 RUSSIA
TELEPHONE + 7-503 956-5555
FAX + 7-503 956-5556

NEW JERSEY OFFICE
ONE NEWARK CENTER
NEWARK, NEW JERSEY 07101-3174
TELEPHONE (201) 639-1234
FAX (201) 639-7298

NEW YORK OFFICE
885 THIRD AVENUE, SUITE 1000
NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10022-4802
TELEPHONE (212) 906-1200
FAX (212) 751-4864

ORANGE COUNTY OFFICE
650 TOWN CENTER DRIVE, SUITE 2000
COSTA MESA, CALIFORNIA 92626-1925
TELEPHONE (714) 540-1235
FAX (714) 755-8290

SAN DIEGO OFFICE
701 "B" STREET, SUITE 2100
SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA 92101-8197
TELEPHONE (619) 236-1234
FAX (619) 696-7419

SAN FRANCISCO OFFICE
505 MONTGOMERY STREET, SUITE 1900
SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94111-2562
TELEPHONE (415) 391-0600
FAX (415) 395-8095

July 3, 1995

RECEIVED

JUL - 3 1995

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

William F. Caton
Acting Secretary
Federal Communications Commission
1919 M Street, NW
Washington, DC 20554

Re: CC Docket No. 92-297, RM-7872, RM-7722
Ex Parte Presentation

Dear Mr. Caton:

On behalf of Hughes Communications Galaxy, Inc., the enclosed letter and attached materials were delivered today to Lisa B. Smith, Legal Advisor to Commissioner Barrett.

An original and two copies of this letter are enclosed. A copy of this letter is being provided simultaneously to Ms. Smith.

Respectfully submitted,

John P. Janka

Enclosures

No. of Copies rec'd
List A B C D E

No. of Copies rec'd
List A B C D E

LATHAM & WATKINS

ATTORNEYS AT LAW

1001 PENNSYLVANIA AVE., N.W., SUITE 1000

WASHINGTON, D.C. 20004-2505

TELEPHONE (202) 637-2200

FAX (202) 637-2201

TLX 590775

ELN 62793269

PAUL R. WATKINS (1899-1973)
DANA LATHAM (1898-1974)

CHICAGO OFFICE

SEARS TOWER, SUITE 5800
CHICAGO, ILLINOIS 60606
TELEPHONE (312) 876-7700
FAX (312) 993-9767

LONDON OFFICE

ONE ANGEL COURT
LONDON EC2R 7HJ ENGLAND
TELEPHONE + 44-71-374 4444
FAX + 44-71-374 4460

LOS ANGELES OFFICE

633 WEST FIFTH STREET, SUITE 4000
LOS ANGELES, CALIFORNIA 90071-2007
TELEPHONE (213) 485-1234
FAX (213) 891-8763

MOSCOW OFFICE

113/1 LENINSKY PROSPECT, SUITE C200
MOSCOW 117198 RUSSIA
TELEPHONE + 7-503 956-5555
FAX + 7-503 956-5556

NEW JERSEY OFFICE

ONE NEWARK CENTER

NEWARK, NEW JERSEY 07101-3174

TELEPHONE (201) 639-1234

FAX (201) 639-7298

NEW YORK OFFICE

885 THIRD AVENUE, SUITE 1000

NEW YORK, NEW YORK 10022-4802

TELEPHONE (212) 906-1200

FAX (212) 751-4864

ORANGE COUNTY OFFICE

650 TOWN CENTER DRIVE, SUITE 2000

COSTA MESA, CALIFORNIA 92626-1925

TELEPHONE (714) 540-1235

FAX (714) 755-8290

SAN DIEGO OFFICE

701 "B" STREET, SUITE 2100

SAN DIEGO, CALIFORNIA 92101-8197

TELEPHONE (619) 236-1234

FAX (619) 696-7419

SAN FRANCISCO OFFICE

505 MONTGOMERY STREET, SUITE 1900

SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA 94111-2562

TELEPHONE (415) 391-0600

FAX (415) 395-8095

July 3, 1995

Lisa B. Smith
Legal Advisor
Office of Commissioner Andrew C. Barrett
Room 826, Stop Code 0103
Federal Communications Commission
1919 M Street, NW
Washington, DC 20554

Re: CC Docket No. 92-297, RM-7872, RM-7722
Ex Parte Presentation

Dear Ms. Smith:

At your request, enclosed on behalf of Hughes Communications Galaxy, Inc. is a brief paper prepared by Stanford Telecom that confirms that allocating two separate, non-contiguous bands of 28 GHz spectrum for LMDS would not increase the cost of implementing an LMDS system and actually would be a benefit for some LMDS configurations.

Also enclosed are two charts that summarize the band segmentation plans and related issues that we discussed last Thursday.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Sincerely yours

John P. Janka

Enclosures

**Assessment of LMDS RF Equipment Start up Costs due to
a Non-contiguous Spectrum Allocation**

Stanford Telecom

RECEIVED
JUL - 3 1995
FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

The following analysis was prepared at the request of Latham & Watkins, counsel to Hughes Communications Galaxy, Inc. This assessment has determined that the Local Multipoint Distribution Service (LMDS) RF equipment start-up cost is not affected by a non-contiguous Ka band (27.5 to 30.0 GHz) spectrum allotment.

Stanford Telecom has become intimately familiar with the LMDS system as reflected in the January 30, 1995¹ and the March 1, 1995² Hughes Communications Galaxy FCC filings. In this second filing, the RF equipment costs were surveyed; and the High Power Amplifier (HPA) was determined to be the most expensive RF system component (approximately 10 times the cost of any other RF component). Furthermore, the HPA cost was estimated to be approximately 25% of the RF cell site start up cost (includes labor, warranty and dual redundant equipment).³

¹ See "Review of the Propagation Characteristics in the 28 and 40 GHz Frequency Bands for LMDS Applications," prepared by Stanford Telecom, in Comments of Hughes Communications Galaxy, Inc. to ET Docket No. 94-124, RM-8308, dated January 30, 1995.

² See "Assessment of Relative Performance and Costs between LMDS in the 28 and 40 GHz Bands: LMDS is viable in the 40 GHz Frequency Band," prepared by Stanford Telecom, in Reply comments of Hughes Communications Galaxy, Inc. to ET Docket No. 94-124 RM-8308, dated March 1, 1995.

³ Pages 19 through 24 of footnote 2.

Wireless cable HPAs have been designed as broad band devices which operate from 27.5 to 30.0 GHz; in fact, Thomson and Varian both have a wide band Ka band (27.5 to 30.0 GHz) HPA which transmits over 100W for wireless cable applications. Since this RF component is a broad band device (2.5 GHz), a non-contiguous spectrum allotment within this 2.5 GHz band would not require additional HPAs or HPA modification for non-contiguous LMDS service within the 27.5 to 30.0 GHz spectrum.

In the European Multichannel Multipoint Distribution Service (MMDS), cell sites have two possible RF configurations. For a tower site, two HPAs are implemented for cell site transmission. For a roof-top site, single channel solid state power amplifiers are implemented for cell site transmission.⁴ For a single channel power amplifier LMDS configuration, non-contiguous spectrum allotment would have absolutely no cost increase since each channel has its own power amplifier within the Ka band for either a contiguous or non-contiguous spectrum allotment.

Since the HPA is by far the most expensive piece of RF equipment and since its cost is not impacted by a non-contiguous spectrum allotment, a cost impact to other RF equipment, such as the receiver subscriber unit, would be minimal if any at all. LMDS RF equipment was developed for broad band

⁴ Page 5 of footnote 2.

applications, not narrow band applications. The LMDS RF equipment must already operate over a 1 GHz bandwidth. Increasing the bandwidth for the low cost RF equipment to 1.5 GHz would cause slight if any cost increase. Endgate Technology corporation was consulted for other RF equipment costs since Endgate is developing receiver subscriber units and RF cell site equipment. Moreover, Endgate has participated in the FCC filing procedures.⁵ According to Executive Vice President Doug Lockie (and author of Endgate FCC filing), "Non-contiguous spectrum allotment has no substantial cost impact to either the subscriber unit or the cell site hub. Furthermore, two way communication becomes easier with non contiguous spectrum allocation." Two equal spaced non-contiguous spectrum bands, such as the suggested spectrum allotment from the combined Boeing, Hughes, Teledesic, and Texas Instruments FCC filing⁶, is a benefit to a full duplex LMDS system. One band is for transmit while the other band is for receive. The separation between the two bands improves isolation which makes signal filtering easier and cheaper.

In summary, a non-contiguous spectrum allocation causes no cost increase to the LMDS system, and is a benefit for some LMDS system configurations.

⁵ Comments of Endgate Technology Corporation, to ET Docket No. 94-124, RM 8303, dated January 30, 1995, presented by Arent Fox.

⁶ See Further Comments of The Boeing Company, Hughes Communications, Inc., Teledesic Corporation, and Texas Instruments, Inc. CC Docket No. 92-297, dated May 12, 1995.

(1)

**Original FCC Staff Proposal
(Including "Natural" Paired Downlinks)**

UPLINK	SERVICES	DOWNLINK
27.5		17.7
28.35 or 28.45	LOCAL MULTIPOINT DISTRIBUTION SERVICE Fixed-Satellite Service (non-GSO and GSO)	18.55 or 18.65
28.85	FIXED-SATELLITE SERVICE (non-GSO) Fixed-Satellite Service (GSO) LMDS grandfathered at 28.35-28.5 for 5 years before non-GSO system likely to operate	19.05
29.1	FIXED-SATELLITE SERVICE (GSO) Fixed-Satellite Service (non-GSO)	19.3
29.25	FIXED-SATELLITE SERVICE (non-GSO MSS Feeder Links) LOCAL MULTIPOINT DISTRIBUTION SERVICE	19.45
29.5	FIXED-SATELLITE SERVICE (GSO) FIXED-SATELLITE SERVICE (non-GSO MSS Feeder Links)	19.7
30.0	FIXED-SATELLITE SERVICE (GSO) Fixed-Satellite Service (non-GSO)	20.2

Uppercase = Primary
Lowercase = Secondary

PRIMARY HUGHES ISSUE:

No feasible solution for GSO/non-GSO sharing at 29.25-29.5/19.45-19.7 other than "reverse band working" by non-GSO systems in the downlink band

(2)

**Revised FCC Staff Proposal
(Including "Natural" Paired Downlinks)**

UPLINK	SERVICES	DOWNLINK
27.5	LOCAL MULTIPOINT DISTRIBUTION SERVICE Fixed-Satellite Service (non-GSO and GSO)	17.7
28.35	FIXED-SATELLITE SERVICE (GSO) Fixed-Satellite Service (non-GSO)	18.55
28.6	FIXED-SATELLITE SERVICE (non-GSO) Fixed-Satellite Service (GSO)	18.8
29.1	FIXED-SATELLITE SERVICE (non-GSO MSS Feeder Links) LOCAL MULTIPOINT DISTRIBUTION SERVICE	19.3
29.25	FIXED-SATELLITE SERVICE (GSO) FIXED-SATELLITE SERVICE (non-GSO MSS Feeder Links)	19.45
29.5	FIXED-SATELLITE SERVICE (GSO) Fixed-Satellite Service (non-GSO)	19.7
30.0		20.2

Uppercase = Primary
Lowercase = Secondary

PRIMARY HUGHES ISSUES:

- (1) No feasible solution for GSO/non-GSO sharing at 29.25-29.5/19.45-19.7 other than "reverse band working" by non-GSO systems in the downlink band
- (2) Grandfathering LMDS at 28.35--28.5 GHz during period when GSO systems likely to be in operation in that band (1998-on)
- (3) Restrictive power limits at 18.6--18.8 GHz